

Public Comments on Amateur Service Rules:=====

Title: Amateur Service Rules

FR Document Number: 2012-26201

Legacy Document ID:

RIN:

Publish Date: 10/24/2012 12:00:00 AM

Submitter Info:

First Name: Daryl

Last Name: Stout

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 55655

City: Little Rock

Country: United States

State or Province: AR

Postal Code: 72215

Comment: As a VE Team Leader in central Arkansas, lowering the number of VE's at a test session to 2 is a "two-edged sword". In some rural areas (especially in Arkansas), it is extremely difficult at times to obtain enough VE's to do a test session. So, in that regard, having just 2 VE's would be good. But, on the other hand, having at least 3 VE's lowers the chance of certifying an exam by fraudulent means. To me, only those VE's who have an exemplary record of service (doing everything by the book, no illegal actions, strongly believe in exam session integrity, having done a large number of sessions, etc.) should be on "teams of 2".

Also, I noted one of the items in the NPRM would allow those with "Technician Plus" licensees to become VE's. Since the "Technician Plus" and "Technician" license class privileges are now identical, and since the FCC corrected a glitch of this type in an earlier NPRM of portions of Part 97 (to where only General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra Class licensees can be VE's), I still stand by the fact that only

those holding a General, Advanced, or Amateur Extra Class license, should be a VE, and that Novices or Technicians should remain ineligible to become a VE.

As for "lifetime credit", in a way, it seems like a "marketing ploy" to get more hams. Just because someone has an amateur radio license doesn't necessarily mean they're going to be active; especially since there is no "on the air time requirement" for licensees, every licensee's situation is different, and the keeping of logbooks is no longer required. I would be curious as to the requirements involved for VE Team leaders, should this part of the NPRM be approved. I'm not as active in the hobby as I used to be; but still work with selected nets and area VE Testing, due to antenna prohibitions, and health issues.

Lastly, per the "emission designators", I have no problem with this part of the NPRM.

Daryl Stout, AE5WX, Little Rock, Arkansas

As a VE Team Leader in central Arkansas, lowering the number of VE's at a test session to 2 is a "two-edged sword". In some rural areas (especially in Arkansas), it is extremely difficult at times to obtain enough VE's to do a test session. So, in that regard, having just 2 VE's would be good. But, on the other hand, having at least 3 VE's lowers the chance of certifying an exam by fraudulent means. To me, only those VE's who have an exemplary record of service (doing everything by the book, no illegal actions, strongly believe in exam session integrity, having done a large number of sessions, etc.) should be on "teams of 2".

Also, I noted one of the items in the NPRM would allow those with "Technician Plus" licensees to become VE's. Since the "Technician Plus" and "Technician" license class privileges are now identical, and since the FCC corrected a glitch of this type in an earlier NPRM of portions of Part 97 (to where only General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra Class licensees can be VE's), I still stand by the fact that only those holding a General, Advanced, or Amateur Extra Class license, should be a VE, and that Novices or Technicians should remain ineligible to become a VE.

As for "lifetime credit", in a way, it seems like a "marketing ploy" to get more hams. Just because someone has an amateur radio license doesn't necessarily mean they're going to be active; especially since there is no "on the air time requirement" for licensees, every licensee's situation is different, and the keeping of logbooks is no longer required. I would be curious as to the requirements involved for VE

Team leaders, should this part of the NPRM be approved. I'm not as active in the hobby as I used to be; but still work with selected nets and area VE Testing, due to antenna prohibitions, and health issues.

Lastly, per the "emission designators", I have no problem with this part of the NPRM.